



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/648,071	08/26/2003	Donald C. Roe	7193CDQ	3375
27752	7590	02/24/2006	EXAMINER	
THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DIVISION WINTON HILL TECHNICAL CENTER - BOX 161 6110 CENTER HILL AVENUE CINCINNATI, OH 45224			STEPHENS, JACQUELINE F	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3761	

DATE MAILED: 02/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/648,071

Applicant(s)

ROE ET AL.

Examiner

Jacqueline F. Stephens

Art Unit

3761

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 9/29/05.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 9-22 and 38-50 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 9-22, and 38-50 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8-24-03
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 9/29/05 has been entered.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments filed 9/29/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

3. Regarding the rejection of claims 1-22 and 39 under 35 USC 112 second paragraph, applicant argues the claims are broad rather than indefinite and cites MPEP 2173.04. The cited section of the MPEP states "IF the claim is too broad because it does not set forth that which applicants regard as their invention as evidenced by statements outside of the application as filed, a rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, would be appropriate". The examiner has rejected claims 1-22 and 39 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter, which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, relying on *Ex parte Slob*, 157

USPQ 172, which states the following regarding an article claimed by defining property values:

“Claims merely setting forth physical characteristics desired in an article, and not setting forth specific compositions which would meet such characteristics, are invalid as vague, indefinite, and functional since they cover any conceivable combination of ingredients either presently existing or which might be discovered in future and which would impart desired characteristics; thus, an expression a liquefiable substance have a liquefaction temperature from about 40 degrees Centigrade to about 300 degrees C and being compatible with the ingredients in the powdered composition, is too broad and indefinite since it purports to cover everything which will perform the desired functions regardless of its composition, and, in effect, recites compounds by what it is desired that they do than what they are; expression also is too broad since it appears to read upon materials that could not possibly be used to accomplish purposes intended”.

In this case, claim 1 recites “a feces modifying agent disposed in the article such that the feces modifying agent is available to contact at least a portion of the feces deposited in the article, wherein the feces modifying agent is present in an effective amount sufficient to decrease the Hardness of at least a portion of the feces by greater than about 25% when the feces modifying agent is present at a concentration of no more than about 5 weight percent”. In claim 39, the limitations read “wherein said reducing agent is present in an effective amount sufficient to decrease the Hardness of at least a portion of the feces by greater than about 25% when the reducing agent is present at a

concentration of no more than about 5 weight percent". In both independent claims 1 and 39, the limitations are not directed to structure or a specific composition, but rather to what the feces modifying agent does, therefore the claims are broad *and indefinite* for reciting only the desired physical properties of the modifying agent, rather than setting forth structural and/or chemical characteristics. Because the claim does not set forth that which applicants regard as their invention, the rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph is maintained.

4. Applicant argues the fact that Yahiaoui's structure is capable of receiving feces does not imply or enable one skilled in the art to decrease the viscoelastic properties of feces using the disclosed viscoelastic agent; and Yahiaoui fails to teach or suggest that the viscoelastant agent has any effect on the Hardness of feces. Applicant argues Yahiaoui fails to recognize this property of the additive and thus fails to teach or suggest providing the additive in a sufficient quantity to reduce the hardness of feces as claimed. It is noted that applicant defines feces modifying agents as "'FMAs', 'viscous bodily waste modifying agents', 'modifying agents', or 'agents' capable of modifying the chemical or physical properties of viscous bodily wastes, such as feces and menses" page 12, lines 17-20 of the specification. Since applicant has not distinguished fecal modifying agents from menses modifying agents, the examiner understands the FMA's taught throughout the disclosure are suitable for feces and menses. Yahiaoui teaches the same compositions as the applicant as a viscoelastant treatment. Therefore, the compositions of Yahiaoui would also be effective for treating feces as well as menses.

Art Unit: 3761

With regard to the sufficient quantity to reduce the hardness of feces, the claimed concentration of the agent (claim 1) is no more than about 5 weight percent, which includes the range of 0-5%, however, for practical reasons, the examiner excludes 0 since some agent has to be present to reduce the hardness of feces. Yahiaoui teaches an add-on amount of 0.1-5% (Abstract), which is within the claimed range.

5. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). Claims 16 and 17 disclose the agent is releasably attached to a portion of the article. In this case, Wellinghoff is relied on to teach an attachment means of a fecal modifying agent to a hydrophilic component comprising hydrogen bonding.

As to the Wellinghoff reference, applicant argues Wellinghoff does not disclose that the invention can be a diaper as asserted by the Office. Wellinghoff explicitly discloses in col. 27, line 44-45 the treated surface can be an absorbent layer for use in diapers. As to whether the article itself can be used as a diaper, the argument is

Art Unit: 3761

directed to an intended use of the product and does not structurally define the claimed invention over the prior art.

6. In response to applicant's argument that Butterworth does not teach a brush structure which includes feces modifying agents, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

7. In response to applicant's argument that Al-Sabah fails to teach or suggest that the audio indicating means is adaptable or capable of delivering a feces modifying agent as recited, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

8. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9. Claims 1-7, 9-22, 39, 40, and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims set forth the physical characteristics desired of the composite alone rather than the specific composition of the composite in the end product. Therefore, relying on Ex parte Slob, 157 USPQ 172, such claims could cover any conceivable combination of materials whether presently existing or which might be discovered in the future and which would impart the desired characteristic, i.e. the claims are too broad and indefinite since they purport to cover everything having the claimed characteristics regardless of its composition (It should be noted that 35 USC 101 sets forth "Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful...composition of matter... may obtain a patent therefor... title, i.e. does not include composition that have yet to be invented and discovered.).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in-

(1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international



Art Unit: 3761

application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(s) of such treaty in the English language.

11. Claims 1, 3-7, 10, 11, 14, 18, 39, and 40, as best understood by the examiner, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yahiaoui et al. USPN 6060636.

As to claims 1, 3, and 39, Yahiaoui discloses an absorbent article adapted to be applied to a wearer's perineal region for receiving feces, the article comprising: a substrate; a means for holding the substrate in contact with the wearer perineal region; and is adapted to receive feces having a first waist region, a second waist region opposed to the first waist region, a crotch region disposed between the first waist region and the second waist region (col. 2, lines 35-44, and col. 8, lines 24-27, where Yahiaoui discloses the invention can be a diaper which is known to have first and second waist regions), the absorbent article comprising: a liquid pervious topsheet; a liquid impervious backsheet joined to at least a portion of the topsheet; an absorbent core disposed between at least a portion of the topsheet and the backsheet (col. 15, lines 24-33), and an effective amount of a feces modifying agent, which decreases the viscosity of the feces (hence, it is interpreted that the agent acts as a reducing agent), disposed in the article such that the reducing agent is available to contact at least a portion of the feces deposited in the article (col. 2, lines 35-57; col. 5, lines 27-35; col. 10, lines 31-52; col. 14, lines 41-58; and col. 15, lines 24-33).

Regarding the Hardness test and the examiner's interpretation of the test and performance characteristics of the instant apparatus claims, when the structure recited in the reference is substantially identical to that of the claims of the instant invention,

Art Unit: 3761

claimed properties or functions are presumed to be inherent (MPEP 2112-2112.01). A *prima facie* case of either anticipation or obviousness has been established when the reference discloses all the limitations of a claim except a property or function and the examiner can not determine whether or not the reference inherently possesses properties which anticipate or render obvious the claimed invention but has basis for shifting the burden of proof as in *In re Fitzgerald*, 619 F.2d 67, 70 205 USPQ 594, 596 (CCPA 1980). In the present case, the reference has met the structural requirements of claims 1 and 39.

As to claims 4, 6, and 10, Yahiaoui discloses the reducing agent decreases the Hardness of the feces reduction by at least about 25% at a concentration of about 0.1-5%, which includes the ranges of 0.1%, no more than about 0.5 weight percent, no more than about 1.5 weight percent, and no more than 5 weight percent (Abstract and col. 5, lines 27-35).

As to claims 5 and 7, Yahiaoui discloses the change in viscoelastic properties of the insulted fluid occurs on contact, which includes the range of no more than about 5 minutes (col. 2, lines 53-59).

As to claims 11, 14, and 40, the absorbent article of claim 1 wherein the reducing agent is disposed on a carrier structure (col. 2, lines 44-53).

As to claim 18, Yahiaoui discloses the absorbent article of claim further includes at least one three-dimensional structure joined to or extending from an element of the absorbent article, the three-dimensional structure comprising the reducing agent, wherein the three-dimensional structure promotes contact between the reducing agent and the feces (col. 2, lines 50-61).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

14. Claims 2 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yahiaoui in view of Cassidy et al. USPN 5567359. Yahiaoui discloses the claimed

Art Unit: 3761

invention except that Yahiaoui teaches alkyl polyglycoside. Alkyl glycosides are functionally equivalent to phenols. For example Cassidy et al. USPN 5567359 teaches alkyl glycosides, betaines and phenols as surfactants (col. 6, lines 6-35). Therefore, because these two are art-recognized equivalents at the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to substitute alkyl glycoside for pheonols or betaines.

15. Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yahiaoui in view of Roe USPN 5643588. Yahiaoui discloses the present invention substantially as claimed. However, Yahiaoui fails to disclose the carrier structure includes a skin care composition. Roe disclose an absorbent article comprising a skin care composition on the topsheet for the benefits of imparting a therapeutic or protective lotion to the wearer (Abstract). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to incorporate a skin care composition in the invention of Yahiaoui for the benefits taught in Roe.

As to claim 13, Yahiaoui/Roe discloses the skin care composition includes components selected from the following group: petroleum oils, petroleum waxes, silicone oils and silicone waxes (Roe Abstract, col. 10, line 37 through col. 12, line 67).

16. Claims 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yahiaoui in view of Wellinghoff et al. USPN 6046243. Yahiaoui discloses the present invention substantially as claimed. However, Yahiaoui does not disclose the reducing

Art Unit: 3761

agent is releasably attached to at least a portion of the article. Wellinghoff discloses an absorbent material treated with a fecal modifying agent that is releasably attached to at least a portion of the article by hydrogen bonding so as not to react with the released gas ( col. 8, lines 46-54; col. 23, lines 9-10; col. 27, lines 35-46). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the reducing agent of Yahiaoui to be releasably attached for the benefits taught in Wellinghoff.

17. Claims 15 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yahiaoui in view of Butterworth et al. USPN 4077410. Yahiaoui discloses the present invention substantially as claimed. However, Yahiaoui fails to disclose the carrier structure includes a brush structure or printed hairs. Butterworth discloses an absorbent article having a brushed surface or printed hairs for the benefit of providing a soft, fibrous outer surface (Butterworth col. 3, lines 16-27 and col. 4, lines 27-43). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the surface sheet of Yahiaoui to have a brushed surface or printed hairs for the benefits taught in Butterworth.

18. Claims 1-3, 20-22, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wellinghoff et al. USPN 6046243.

As to claims 1-3, and 39, Wellinghoff discloses an absorbent article adapted to be applied to a wearer's perineal region for receiving feces, the article comprising: a

substrate; a means for holding the substrate in contact with the wearer perineal region; receive feces having a first waist region, a second waist region opposed to the first waist region, a crotch region disposed between the first waist region and the second waist region (col. 27, lines 4-45, where Wellinghoff discloses the invention can be a diaper which is known to have first and second waist regions). Wellinghoff does not disclose the absorbent article comprising: a liquid pervious topsheet; a liquid impervious backsheet joined to at least a portion of the topsheet; an absorbent core disposed between at least a portion of the topsheet and the backsheet. However, it is old and well known in the art to provide a diaper with a topsheet, backsheet, and absorbent core as claimed.

Wellinghoff further discloses an effective amount of a reducing agent, which decreases the viscosity of the feces, disposed in the article such that the reducing agent is available to contact at least a portion of the feces deposited in the article (col. 9, lines 42-50; col. 27, lines 42-44), wherein the reducing agent is selected from the group consisting of sulfites, thiols, alcohols, mercaptoacetic acid, sodium thioglycolate, thiolactic acid, thioglycoamide, glycerol monothioglycolate, borohydrides, tertiary amines, thiocyanates, thiosulfates, cyanides, thiophosphates, arsenites, phosphines, betaines, hydroxylamine, and  $\text{LiHB}(\text{C}_2\text{H}_5)_3$  (col. 11, lines 54-60).

Regarding the Hardness test and the examiner's interpretation of the test and performance characteristics of the instant apparatus claims, when the structure recited in the reference is substantially identical to that of the claims of the instant invention, claimed properties or functions are presumed to be inherent (MPEP 2112-2112.01). A

Art Unit: 3761

*prima facie* case of either anticipation or obviousness has been established when the reference discloses all the limitations of a claim except a property or function and the examiner can not determine whether or not the reference inherently possesses properties which anticipate or render obvious the claimed invention but has basis for shifting the burden of proof as in *In re Fitzgerald*, 619 F.2d 67, 70 205 USPQ 594, 596 (CCPA 1980). In the present case, the reference has met the structural requirements of claims 1 and 39.

As to claim 21, Wellinghoff discloses comprising a gas evolving system including at least one composition which evolves gas when mixed with water, wherein the gas evolving system delivers the reducing agent to the feces (Abstract, col. 8, lines 3-6; col. 9, lines 1-7; col. 9, lines 41-50).

As to claims 20, 22, 38, and 49, Wellinghoff discloses a gas evolving system including a water soluble material, which acts as a sensor, containing compressed gas which evolves when mixed with water, wherein the gas evolving system acts as an actuator by delivering the reducing agent to the feces and the reducing agent is disposed adjacent a water soluble film (col. 39, lines 29-62). As to the limitations of the topsheet, backsheet, and core, see the discussion of claims 1-3 and 39 *supra*.

19. Claims 38 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yahiaoui in view of Al-Sabah USPN 5868723.

As to claims 38, 41, and 43, in reference to the structure of the waist regions, crotch region, topsheet, backsheet, and absorbent core Yahiaoui discloses the present invention substantially as claimed (see 102 rejection of claim 1). However, Yahiaoui does not disclose a responsive system including a sensor operatively connected to the article. Al-Sabah discloses an absorbent article comprising an acoustic transducer **29** and an actuator **43**, which comprises a power source 42 (Figure 7). The actuator performs a responsive function when the sensor detects an input (Abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Yahiaoui to incorporate a sensor as taught in Al-Sabah. Doing so would provide a means for alerting the user or a health care professional of the presence of the waste material.

The invention of Yahiaoui/ Al-Sabah provides a sensor adapted to detect an input, and an actuator operatively connected to the article, the actuator being adapted to deliver an effective amount of a reducing agent to the feces when the sensor detects the input. Yahiaoui discloses the reducing agent decreases the Hardness of the feces reduction by at least about 25% at a concentration of about 0.1-5%, which includes the ranges of 0.1%, no more than about 0.5 weight percent, no more than about 1.5 weight percent, and no more than 5 weight percent (Abstract and col. 5, lines 27-35).

As to claims 44, 46, and 48, Yahiaoui/Al-Sabah discloses the reducing agent decreases the Hardness of the feces reduction by at least about 25% at a concentration of about 0.1-5%, which includes the ranges of 0.1%, no more than about



Art Unit: 3761

0.5 weight percent, no more than about 1.5 weight percent, and no more than 5 weight percent (Abstract and col. 5, lines 27-35).

As to claims 45 and 47, Yahiaoui/Al-Sabah discloses the change in viscoelastic properties of the insulted fluid occurs on contact, which includes the range of no more than about 5 minutes (col. 2, lines 53-59).

20. Claim 42 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yahiaoui in view of Al-Sabah as applied to claim 38 above and further in view of Cassidy et al. USPN 5567359. Yahiaoui/Al-Sabah discloses the claimed invention except that Yahiaoui/Al-Sabah teaches alkyl polyglycoside. Alkyl glycosides are functionally equivalent to phenols. For example Cassidy et al. USPN 5567359 teaches alkyl glycosides, betaines and phenols as surfactants (col. 6, lines 6-35). Therefore, because these two are art-recognized equivalents at the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to substitute alkyl glycoside for pheonols or betaines.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jacqueline F. Stephens whose telephone number is (571) 272-4937. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00-5:30.

Art Unit: 3761

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tanya Zalukaeva can be reached on (571) 272-1115. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Jacqueline F Stephens  
Examiner  
Art Unit 3761

October 17, 2005